DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 794 CS 500 360

AUTHOR Heath, Robert L.; Olson, Donald W.
TITLE Status Study of High School Speech Education in Texas.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 30p.; Unpublished research conducted at the University of Houston

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; Cocurricular Activities; *Curriculum Design; Curriculum Development; High School Curriculum; *Secondary Grades; *Speech Curriculum; *Speech Education; *Speech Skills; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Results of a 1972 survey of speech communication education in Texas secondary schools indicate that the traditional activities-oriented method still prevails. Competitive activities receive high priority and quite probably influence development of the speech curriculum. There is little attention paid to communication theory or to the behavioral objectives approach. Further, the students who exhibit problems created by cultural, bilingual, or socioeconomic differences--and who could benefit most from a communications course--generally do not elect to take the course. There are differences of opinion about the nature and emphasis of course content between those teachers who prefer the traditional performance approach and those who are more interested in helping students to develop individual communication skills. The development of new texts and innovative curriculum guides is considered to be an essential requirement. (RN)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 079794

STATUS STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH EDUCATION IN TEXAS

Robert L. Heath, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Speech
University of Houston
Department of Speech
Houston, Texas 77004

Donald W. Olson, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor of Speech
University of Houston
Department of Speech
Houston, Texas 77004

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert L. Heath
Donald W. Olson
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

500 360

STATUS STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH EDUCATION IN TEXAS

Secondary speech education in Texas, as has been the tendency on the national scene, seems to follow changes which occur at the college and university level. Indications are that the high school speech curricular thrust is slowly phasing out of the traditional activities orientation based upon public speaking and into a more pragmatic communication skills approach underpinned by a global view of communication. Certain Texas Education Agency officials, who are in a position to influence curricular development, endorse and encourage this change. At annual Texas Speech Association meetings discussion focuses on the theory and methodology necessary to change to a communication skills program.

Perhaps the speech teacher training programs are in the most strategic position to influence high school speech curriculum. Operating from this belief, the authors surveyed secondary school speech teachers in an attempt to define the status of speech education in Texas and, in so doing, to discover areas which need development and modification to facilitate more rapid and productive transition.

In October, 1972, a long, detailed, open-ended questionnaire was mailed to 398 high school speech teachers. Several respondents complained about the length and demands of the questionnaire. These features may have discouraged many from answering; however, 106 (26.6%) replies were received and provide the statistical basis for the following observations. Despite this small return the data generated by the questionnaire, in significant areas, confirmed that

produced by other state studies.[1] In composite, all such studies provide a global and clearer picture of speech training across the nation.

QUESTIONNAIRE - SAMPLING PROCEDURES

The mailing list consisted of a population which is skewed toward schools with active competitive speech programs. A mailing of all Texas high schools with speech programs was unavailable. A disproportionate number of large, class 4A schools (44) reported in comparison to a small number of class B schools (4). Conclusions about large school programs are based on a more representative N than are those about small schools.[2] Awareness that larger schools have more complex programs than smaller schools warns us sufficiently to guard our conclusions. Yet the flourishing programs of the 4A schools serve as prototypes for smaller schools developing their own programs, and therefore set trends that influence curriculum development and emphasis.

Because of the detail requested and the completion time involved, the sample population is probably skewed toward the more active, professional, and ego-involved speech teacher. Despite these limitations, the data gathered are sufficiently provocative to report.

DEMOGRAPHIC CONDITIONS AND SPEECH EDUCATION

Optimally each school's speech program should be adapted to the needs of the students in that particular school. State curriculum guides and teacher training programs, which ignore the diversity of student types which may exist in a particular school, fail to provide the proper training and support for the teacher

who must meet student needs.

The effort, which was made to determine local adaptations to student needs defined demographically, failed to produce any significant findings. However, the survey suggests that the statistically normative student who takes speech is white, middle class, and from a locality which has either heavy industry or agriculture as the primary source of income. The situation which a teacher may find in a particular school sometimes differs significantly from this gene al type; 30-40 per cent are from lower and upper lower income levels and probably lack good models for the communication skills vocationally acceptable for professional, managerial occupations.

Some correlation exists between size of school and ratios among ethnic groups. Students, which are members of a certain ethnic group, may need oral communication training different from that of students in other groups. Students within an ethnic group may have varying needs; factors other than ethnic group— particularly parent's socio-economic level— may be a more significant factor in determining oral communication requirements. However, some interesting patterns exist which warrant analysis of ethnic group populations.

In the population defined by the questionnaire, Anglos constitute 67 per cent of the high school population; Chicanos comprise 21.9 per cent; and 11.1 per cent are black.

Percentages of High School Students Separated by School Size and Ethnic Group[3]

Class of H.S.	%Blacks	%Chicanos	%Anglo
4A	15.6	20.1	64.3
3A	11.4	19.0	69.6
2A	6.7	22.2	71.1
1A	5.0	33.0	62.0
B	5.0	19.1	75.9

The relative percentages of these groups differs positively with the size of high school. Larger schools have a higher percentage of black students, and smaller schools tend to have more white students. No pattern exists for Chicano students. The full impact of these statistics is appreciated when it is noted that speech classes tend to be for whites only — especially failing to entice students who are from a low socio-economic class. The tragedy of this statement is compounded when one finds all three characteristics in the same student.

Sensitivity to demographic conditions may be necessary in the design of speech curriculum. Pluralism, with adaptation to local needs, seems more advantageous than a single monolithic, statewide curriculum.[4] While being sensitive to the humanistic study of speech, curriculum should serve as a bridge between family background and career. If skills in oral communication of all types should replace the typical speech curriculum, then this goal is far from realization.

TYPICAL SPEECH COURSE

Speculation was confirmed that the typical speech course is a blend of activities, such as interpretation, dramatics, debate, discussion, and public speaking, with public speaking predominating. The oral communication approach, differing from the traditional speech approach, arises from a fundamental adherence to process and to meaning-centered orientation, and emphasizes skills which include platform performance but extend beyond into all dimensions of verbal and nonverbal cues.[5] The general design of each class depends on the teacher's judgment; the different predilections

and training of each teacher account for the variety in curriculum.

In the design of the speech course, prevailing factors are the judgment of the teacher, the text, some slight awareness of various curriculum guides, and the pressures of speech competition.

Rather than following curriculum guidelines established by Texas Education Agency, most teachers rely upon other sources when constructing their courses. Sixty-six per cent of the respondents said that their school district did not have a curriculum guide. Of those indicating that the school district had a guide, only three said that they were required to use the guide. In the absence of a required curriculum guide, 85 per cent rely on their own judgment; 9 per cent rely on textbooks; and 6 per cent rely on the Texas Education Agency guide and other curriculum guides. Thus, speech teachers are autonomous in creating their curriculum. Several of them indicated that the course was based upon "student needs"; however, these needs were not specified.

The full impact of this autonomy is difficult to assess. One startling factor connected with this degree of autonomy is that 30 per cent indicated that they did not feel that they had been "adequately trained in Speech." This situation is even more revealing when it is noted that the smaller schools, which generally lack other faculty members capable of advising speech curriculum construction, are more likely to have teachers who admit to inadequate training. Twenty-three per cent of those in 4A schools admit inadequacy; 24 per cent of 3A; 32 per cent of 1A; and 100 per cent of class B. In spite of these perceived inadequacies, these teachers generally indicated no major influences, over their

judgment, other than the textbook.

Despite the lack of any standard curriculum guide as source of influence, the design of the speech courses tends to be similar in content but different in emphasis.[6] Ninety-six per cent indicated curriculum which is best described as traditional speech. Sixteen per cent indicated a desire to include interpersonal communication; 2 per cent desire some attention to communication theory.

Those who desire to include interpersonal communication theory and communication theory tend to have fewer years of teaching experience; this situation probably indicates that new teachers are interested in giving an oral communication dimension to their classwork. The average years of experience of those indicating an oral communication interest is 4.5 years; whereas 6.1 years is the average length of experience for Texas Speech teachers. The trend toward an emphasis on communication skills is probably spurred by the curriculum in the teacher's preparation rather than an interest in developing new curriculum to keep pace with the field.

With teachers lacking confidence in their training and a lack of universal curriculum guidelines, the text becomes integral to the theory of the course. A problem exists insofar as many teachers are dissatisfied with their text, and the trend toward communication skills is slowed to the extent that innovative material is not included in the available texts. Respondents use one or more of eleven texts, about which different degrees of satisfaction were expressed. Some teachers use more than one text; 14 per cent use no text.

Text	% Used	(Frequency of Response)					(Frequency of Response)													
		Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Minimally satisfied	Moderately dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Difficult	Easy	Lacks model speeches	Out-dated	Lacks Speech composition (logic)	Non-utilitarian	Too general	Unorganized	Uninteresting	Too Mechanical	No contest material	Too theoretical	No material on group dynamics	No communication theory
Modern Speech	15	1	4	4	3	1	2	0	2	2	1	6	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
New American Speech	23	1	7	4	5	3	1	3	1	4	2	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Art of Speaking	27	4	6	5	8	5	1	3	2	5	0	5	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	1
Speech in American Society	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech in Action	14	0	4	2	1	5	0	1	0	5	0	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1
Principles of Public Speaking	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thirty-eight Basic Spc. Exper.	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech for Today	15	1	1	4	2	4	1	2	2	3	0	4	2	1	0	0	2	2	1	0
A Guide for Debate	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Speech: A High School Course	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals		7	26	23	20	19	5	9	9	21	4	24	19	8	5	2	4	4	3	2
	Percentage of respondents using text	Degree of Satisfaction					Reason for Dissatisfaction													

Dissatisfaction with text material is sufficent to warrant evaluation and recommendation of different texts. The reasons for dissatisfaction vary; however, the three most frequently mentioned are that available texts are outdated, too general, and non-utilitarian. These shortcomings are amplified by the realization that these texts probably provide the backbone of theory for most courses. The tendency for speech classes to emphasize traditional speech performance-training is reinforced by these texts; attempts to implement an oral communication orientation are frustrated by the nonexistence or nonavailability of alternative texts.[7]

The content of the average speech course indicated a strong commitment to a traditional speech activities orientation. The average course consists of: public speaking, 10.9 weeks; discussion, 4 weeks; interpretation, 5.2 weeks; debate, 3.2 weeks; dramatics, 4.2 weeks; interpersonal communication, 2.6 weeks; communication theory, 1.5 weeks; parlimentary procedure, 1.2 weeks; voice and diction, 3.4 weeks; and conflict resolution, .7 weeks.[8]

Description of Average High School Speech I Class

Course	Mean in Weeks	Range	SD
Public Speaking	10.9	30-2	5.5
Interpretation	5.2	18-0	3.7
Dramatics	4.2	18-0	4.2
Discussion	4.0	12-0	2.9
Voice and Diction	3.4	11-0	2.5
Debate	3.2	18-0	3.1
Interpersonal Communication	2.6	9-0	2.5
Communication Theory	1.5	8-0	1.8
Parlimentary Procedure	1.2	6-0	1.3
Conflict Resolution	.7	5-0	1.2

Debate is offered as a separate course by 10 per cent of the respondents, and dramatics by 14 per cent; a few separate courses in interpretation are offered. Of all the instruction units, voice and diction was least unitized; 26 per cent indicated that voice and diction was taught continuously.

Another view of the basic course is achieved by determining the prevailing purposes of speech educational and behavioral objectives.[9]

	Purposes of Speech	Behavioral Objectives
	%	%
Communication Effectiveness	85	43
Social Adjustment	48	53
Delivery	14	33
Diction	6	11
Oral Interpretation Appreciation	3	7
Logical Thinking	9	20
Platform Speaking	5	6
Research	1	6
Parlimentary Procedure	0	1
Listening	3	4
Self-concept	5	14
Organization	7	6
Understand Mass Media	0	2
An elective	2	0
	N=88	N=72

Considering the heavy emphasis on public speaking, debate, interpretation, and dramatics (total 23.5 weeks), one can assume that communication effectiveness means a vocally clear, coherent, and physically well delivered formal presentation. A primary consideration is the extent to which effective public speaking, debate, interpretation and dramatic skills transfer into "communication effectiveness." The underlying objectives, however vague, of achieving communication effectiveness and social adjustment must be achievable by these four

activities, because in the statements of behavioral objectives and purposes such skills as platform performance, oral interpretation appreciation, dramatic expression, and delivery were de-emphasized. Curriculum design and response to this questionnaire are probably guided more by bold idealism than sound, reasonable, and achievable objectives.

In contrast with this idealism, the teacher is confronted with a principal who is viewed as not strongly supporting speech study.[10] The category where most agreement exists on whether speech study is essential. These data reflect tne teacher's perception of the principal's attitude.

Teacher's Attitude and Teacher's Perception of Principal's Attitude Toward Speech

View of Activity	% of H.S. Teacher's Attitude	% of Teacher's Perceiving Principal's Attitude
essential	82	38
competition	37	41
central	21	17
indirect	6	24
frill	0	15
fun	24	15

Because of the perceptions of the principals' attitudes toward speech, teachers probably view their primary responsibility as being a promoter of successful competitive programs.

Tied in with this emphasis on competitive speech is the use of classtime in the basic speech course to prepare for contest activity. Sixty-two per cent of the respondents indicated that some classtime was devoted to contest preparation. One respondent indicated that 100 per cent of classtime was devoted to contest preparation; most indicated that "very little time" was so used; and of those giving a per cent,

10-20 per cent was the typical amount of time alloted.

Competitive activities are vital to the programs of the respondents. Forty-two per cent indicated that they were not satisfied by the present extent of competitive activities participated in with their school. Of those dissatisfied with the present amount of speech activities, only three wanted less activity.

Extra Curricular Activity by Class of High School

	Class 4A	Class 3A	Class 2A	Class 1A	Class B
Very Active	41%	22%	32%	0%	25%
Active	30%	37%	32%	33%	50%
Some	23%	26%	27%	67%	0%
Inactive	07%	04%	09%	0%	0%
Very Inactive	0%	11%	0%	0%	25%

All three respondents who wanted less activity were from 4A schools heavily committed to speech activities. Most of the respondents who desired more activities were from 4A, 3A, and 2A schools and had indicated moderate and active commitment. Three respondents in "very active" programs wanted more activity. Speech activities and competition are high priority to speech teachers. These activities, combined with principal's attitudes, the use of classtime for preparation, and the nature of the available texts, serve to maintain predominance of traditional speech training.

The incidence of speech as a course requirement in the school curriculum was of concern to the respondents. Speech is required in only 3.6 per cent of the schools surveyed.[11] In 18 per cent of the schools one year of speech could be substituted for one year of English. In only 2 of 103 responses was speech not separate from English. When asked what changes were desired in speech education,

42 per cent indicated that they wanted it required.

If the classification of students taking speech is an indicator of the perceived value of speech, no pattern was spotted. The average speech class would be populated equally by "all grades": Freshmen 23.4, Sophomore 22.4, Junior 24.5, and Senior 29.7. There may be a slight tendency to postpone speech until the last year or to take it in the last year so as to enjoy a lighter classload; however, from the information available from the survey such a conclusion must be tentative.

If morning class hours are more desirable, then speech enjoys a favored spot in scheduling. Contrary to supposition, speech is not generally a first-hour or last-hour subject. Fifty-six per cent of the speech classes are in the morning. Second period is the hour most frequently assigned for speech; fifth period is second most frequent. Only fourth period was less frequently assigned to speech than was sixth period.

Class hour	% of day by hour
1	17.6
2	21.6
3	16.5
4	11.4
5	18.2
6	11.8
7	2.2

Another curricular-scheduling feature of speech education is the fact that in a given school year students from small schools are more likely to take speech than are those from large schools.

Percentage of Speech Students Compared With Total Enrollment

School size	% of total enrollment taking speech	Standard deviation	Range
4A	7.5	4.5	21-1
3A	10.7	9.5	36-0
2A	12.5	10.5	50-2
1A	11.6	4.6	16-4
B	16.0	9.1	24-4

The percentage of total students which study speech is smaller in large schools, but the opportunity of taking speech in the large schools is statistically more stable. Wide variance exists among smaller schools which probably indicates that the strength and popularity of speech in small schools is highly subject to the varied ability and attitude of teachers and the different attitudes of principals. Across all school sizes, 10 per cent of the total enrollment take speech, but the standard deviation is rather large, 8.1.

Teachers in smaller schools are confronted by smaller classes. Across the state the average speech class size is 21.8 students.

School size	Average class size
4A	25.9
3A	19.5
2A	20.0
1A	14.7
B	11.5

Although the largest class reported had 38 students, the average is more manageable. Clearly the amount of time which can be devoted to each student increases as the size of the school decreases. Ironically, teachers in small schools feel less adequately trained so that the advantage of better student-teacher ratio may be

offset by lack of competance.

Several conclusions seem appropriate. Most speech classes are taught by teachers who have a traditional speech orientation and who favor active and very active competitive programs. Speech classes are, on the average, of a manageable size allowing time for individual work. Some classtime is given to contest preparation. The preponderance of classtime is devoted to public speaking, debate, drama, and interpretation. Some teachers include modest amounts of communication and interpersonal communication theory. Voice and diction plays a prominent role in the speech class, although, in most programs, it is taught as an on-going activity rather than as a autonomous unit.

An average class is likely to meet in the morning in the second period or in fifth period during the afternoon. The text used will probably not be liked by the teacher because it is outdated, too general, or non-utilitarian. In curriculum preparation, teachers (one third of whom feel inadequately trained) are allowed great freedom.

Obvious differences exist due to wide variance in school size. Teachers in larger high schools seem to prefer more involvement in forensic activities than do teachers from small schools. In smaller schools a higher percentage of the total student body enroll in speech class; also, smaller schools have smaller speech classes. However, teachers in smaller schools more often lack confidence in their training than do teachers in the larger schools.

Some conflict exists between the attitudes of speech teachers

toward their programs and the attitudes of their principals as seen by the teacher. Speech teachers see their program to be much more essential than do the principals. Competition is the most frequently indicated view of the principal toward the program. Also, teachers believe that a modest percentage of principals hold the attitude that speech is of indirect value or a frill.

Although 85 per cent of the respondents seek "communicative effectiveness" as a purpose, one can wonder how this is behaviorally achievable. Idealism, rather than viable behavioral objectives, seems to guide the development of speech curriculum.

COMMUNICATION IMPROVEMENT

Second only to "communication effectiveness," the achievement of "social adjustment" guides efforts of high school speech teachers. Forty-eight per cent listed "social adjustment" as a purpose of speech education, and 53 per cent cited it as a behavioral objective. However, since the classes have a predominantly public speaking orientation and since such a speech class threatens many students who need to become better communicators, the potential impact of oral communication improvement is probably minimal. Secondly, two administrative changes are necessary to achieve the full potential: (1) Oral communication is not required, thus, many who need it will avoid it since they lack skills which will make them academically successful in speech. (2) Teachers and counselors do not systematically screen students to determine who can best use training in oral communication. The traditional orientation with an emphasis on "platform eloquence" discourages some students who could use training in oral communication as means for socio-economic development. And finally, many teachers admit to an

inability to diagnose and correct problems of oral communication. Basic to all of the apparent problems is a need for an oral communication, rather than a contest activity orientation, an end to teaching speech as remediation, and a start to emphasize oral-communication-as-skills-acquisition.

Four questions probed the extent to which speech training is received by students who are culturally different from average middle class Anglos, who are bilingual, or who are socio-economically disadvantaged. The survey indicates that Texas high school speech education provides most for those who are already reasonably proficient at oral communication and public speaking. Students in speech class often come from family environments which provide knowledge about how to be interviewed, how to conduct oneself as a sales clerk, how to be a secretary or receptionist, or how to work together in a creative, supportive problem-solving situation. These are communication skills which many lower class, culturally different, and bilingual or bidialectical students lack. And these students are discouraged from taking speech because of its remediation thrust or the perceived inability to compete in the speech class environment.

Thirty-three respondents indicated that they worked with students to overcome problems created by bilingualism. Fifty-three responded that they worked with students to overcome problems created by being culturally different. Thirty-six respondents claim to help students eliminate problems created by socio-economic disadvantages. The reliability of these answers is highly questionable because of the lack of standardized procedures for determining the existence and degree of severity of these problems.

The fourth question asked: "If you are aware of students in your school who exhibit problems created by socio-economic differences, bilingualism, or cultural differences, please indicate how many and whether these students generally take speech." Seventy-six of the respondents indicated the presence of such students. Most said that very few take speech. Ten per cent of those needing special skills was the highest per cent reported taking speech. Conclusion: the vast majority of students, for whom speech-communication could provide skills which may be helpful in socio-economic development, fail to take speech. Thus, speech teachers probably fail to meet their two primary objectives—communication effectiveness and socio-economic (social adjustment?) development—for the students who need it most.

The explanations of efforts to help these students smack of remediation and are culturally and pejoratively loaded. Most of the teachers recognizing the problem believe themselves inadequately trained to work effectively in this area. Articulation problems are most frequently concentrated upon despite the fact that dialectical variance is only part of the total problem. Undoubtedly, prejudice both toward and by the students keeps the educational experience from being satisfactory. New attitudes, new training methods, and new screening techniques are needed. Some respondents' comments illuminate the dimensions of this problem.

Some are sensitive to the problems, some are not. In a school with 79 per cent white population, the respondent observes that "20%-25% have problems -- 5% take speech." "I'm sure that the few

Blacks in our school need attention; however, they are all enrolled in vocational programs and don't take speech." Is speech not an aspect of vocational training? "We have the problem, but I have neither time nor training to deal with it." "I am able to spot or diagnose these situations, but do not know how to correct them."

Attitudes seem to play a big part in this problem. Some teachers appear to be extraordinarily insensitive: "No, they refuse to change their dialects." Others are more open: "So far teachers have not been able to reach these students due to hostility on students' part." Others are making success: "They do not take speech normally, although by making friends with some, I am getting more involved."

Students with communication problems "fear" speech, are "embarrassed" by speaking, lack "self-confidence," or "don't want to express themselves even if they're in speech." "Most [low socio-economic] students consider speech habits either affected or sissy." "It saddens me to think that those who need it the most may never have a speech class!"

Some respondents acknowledge need for curriculum changes to accommodate these special problems. One added phonetics; one has students working in a pilot lab. Another sees the need for specialized courses -- possibly "Business Speaking." One taught a course exclusively for children of migrant laborers.

What helps? A strong attitude of support, emphasis on pluralistic communication, and the ability to deal with speech communication from the students' point of view. From an El Paso school, a respondent indicated that "more and more students realize

the benefit of speech if they are to compete in an Anglo world for jobs and honors." Some seek only to make students aware of the differences between their communication patterns and those of middle America.

Respondents gave no indication of dealing with speech skills such as group problem-solving or business communication i.e., interviewing or communication patterns for a secretary or receptionist, etc.; they were seemingly not sensitive to "cultural noise" and focused mostly on pronunciation and grammar. No indication was given that exercises were used to help people overcome conflict in interpersonal communication. No evidence exists that speech class is used to sensitize middle class Anglo students to the need to eliminate communication problems which they may have with those who are bilingual, culturally different, or socio-economically disadvantaged. If whites recognize that they allow cultural noise to hamper communication, many communication problems created by cultural differences would be eliminated. I "try to make students aware so that they will attempt to improve" is the most typical reflected and indicates the lack of sophistication needed to cope with this educational problem.

Speech can be valuable in educating students to resolve conflict, minimize cultural noise, become bilingual or bidialectical in order to advance socio-economically, and to improve the students' self-understanding. A sensitivity to the communication problems of the culturally different student is only possible when speech communication is seen to be more than remediation and when white middle class students understand that communication is a multi-dimensional process and that the pattern of speech which they

use is different from others and situationally advantageous. More effort must be made to teach speech communication skills which truly provide for socio-economic advancement and which can be used for problem-solving and conflict resolution as well.

THE TEACHER

The typical Texas speech teacher has taught for 6 years, views competitive activities as being important, has a course which is activities oriented, is trained in and therefore teaches traditional speech education with a strong emphasis on public speaking, and views speech education as designed to improve delivery, to handle ideas, and to achieve communication effectiveness and social adjustment.

To provide a background in communication theory, innovative teaching techniques, and the general background to eliminate the feelings of inadequate training,[12] summer institutes could be provided by various colleges and universities. Forty-two per cent indicate that they would attend such a teacher's summer institute; one-third would not; and one-fourth might.

Several topics stand out as needing development and improvement. The emphasis is traditional with interest in innovative teaching methods, traditional speech refresher training, and contest preparation predominating.

Topics of Interest for Summer Teacher's Institute

Topics	Percentage indicating desired area (n=72)
Innovative speech techniques	56
Traditional speech refresher	25
Methods for contest preparation	10
Methods to improve student and teacher communication	7
Handle socio-economic difficulties	6
Methods for motivating students	4
Curriculum development in interpersonal communication	4
Curriculum development in Drama	3
Curriculum development in Interpretation	1

Apparently the desire is to become better, more creative teachers of traditional speech. Significantly, methods for contest preparation are perceived as needing more attention than handling socio-economic difficulties and curriculum development in Interpersonal Communication.

The administrative environment in each high school is crucial to the strength of the speech program and determines the kind of program offered. To achieve the ideal speech program most of the respondents sought various changes. Most of the changes desired for speech education are administrative. Responses were grouped into these categories:

	Percentage favoring change (N=64)
Speech as required course	42
Administrative changes[13]	25
Expanded curriculum in Speech[14]	21
Better texts	6
Inclusion of communication theory	5
Satisfied	5
Inclusion of interpersonal communication theory	5
Speech as alternate to English	3
Less tournament activity	3
More speech education classes offered	3
Seeking innovative speech projects	3
More teaching aids (visual-audio)	2

These responses interestingly do not emphasize curriculum changes. Apparently most of the teachers are free to teach what they want to and are doing so.

Fundamental to the creation and development of high school speech programs are the attitudes of the teachers. The questionnaire invited responses concerning the teachers' philosophies fundamental to teaching speech. To understand the transition to oral communication, some idea of the prevailing attitudes is necessary.

The authors noted that most of the teachers are sensitive to the need for speech education as a part of high school education. Certain attitudes predominated: Speech is "vital" and "essential;" Speech and success are inseparable; motivation is sometimes a problem; and Speech is often a "fill-in" course.[1]

"I feel that the need is present for all students to receive training in interpersonal communication. I might favor a mini-course being required in this area of speech education. Debate and public speaking should be offered primarily for the more able students; academically corrective speech education should also be available."

"My personal feelings are you cannot separate success and speech skills. The self-confidence, research techniques, and pride of personal achievement can be found in very few circles outside the speech classroom."

"All students should be taught the ideas and methods of proper communication techniques so that they may cope with the world and its people in an intelligent manner. Without adequate communication, man will wither and die."

"I have no idea how to motivate those students from lower socio-economic backgrounds.'

"Too many times speech is considered a 'fill-in' course. In small schools the speech teacher is a 'fill-in' — the English teacher often 'automatically' teaches speech too."

"We should teach communication, not formal public speaking only. It should be changed from the dumping ground for people who fail other courses. A course for majors and one for outcasts would be advantageous."

"We as speech teachers should help the student find himself as a mover in his society. Good speech, in public speeches and in private conversation, is still the best method known for this goal."

"I believe it can and should do more for his personal development than any other course he might take."

"Every student should have to take it, and it should create more competitive spirit. More activities in speech need to be related to tournament activities."

"Speech should teach responsibility and respect for the truth."

"Teachers of speech need to recognize that 'communications' is the new subject area, second only to vocational education, as a part of the curriculum of the future. Then they need help from TEA to help make principals and other teachers accept this fact. They also need to update the classroom situation so that pure speech making is not the only type of activity covered."[16]

A wide spectrum exists in the views of speech teachers. One respondent provides a good summary: "There seems to be a lack of uniformity in speech education across the state. All students do not have an equal opportunity to get an adequate speech education."

CONCLUSION

Changes in high school speech education are needed and forthcoming; they are welcomed by a minority of teachers. Nevertheless the present commitment is strongly traditional and competitive activities oriented. Updating texts and curriculum is important to meeting some of the major objectives of these teachers. A

major battle may occur in coming years between those dedicated to competition and those adopting an oral communication orientation. This split may be greatest over the question of what speech education should do for the student. The traditional speech education works on a "great orator" model that emphasizes performance and remediation which scares away students who fall outside that model. The oral communication model emphasizes a wide variety of communication skills and approaches communication differences pluralistically. Sensitive attention to this split through teacher training programs, creation of new texts, and innovative curriculum guides will be important to the advancement of the field.

This study confirmed several suspicions held by the authors:

1. Traditional activities oriented speech education prevails.
2. Competitive activities still receive top priority.
3. Little expert help is available for students who need communication skills for socio-economic development.
4. Tradition and idealism rather than viable behavioral objective guide curriculum development.
5. Considerable difference exists in the nature and emphasis of the content in speech classes; these differences are more likely due to the ability, interests, and training of the teacher than to the needs of students.
6. Communication theory is struggling for a place in speech education.
7. The quality of education, the breadth of the program, the extent of commitment to competitive activities,

average class enrollment, and the percentage of students taking speech are variously related to school size.

8. Differences exist between teachers' and principals' attitudes toward speech classes.
9. High school speech texts are unsatisfactory.
10. No standard state wide curriculum guide is followed.
11. Speech teachers see Speech as vital and essential and want it required. But as of now it is not as respected as written English nor is it central to high school education.

This last observation may pose the greatest challenge of this decade.

Footnotes

1. Other status studies are William D. Brooks, "The Status of Speech in Secondary Schools: A Summary of State Studies," The Speech Teacher, XVIII (November 1969), 276-281; Mardel Ogilvie, "The Status of Speech in Secondary Schools of New York State," The Speech Teacher, XVIII (January 1969), 39-44; Sharon A. Ratliffe and Deldee M. Herman, "The Status of Speech in High Schools of Michigan," The Speech Teacher, XVIII (January 1969), 45-49; Remo P. Fausti and Robert W. Voglesang, "The Status of Speech in High Schools of the State of Washington," The Speech Teacher, XVIII (January 1969), 50-53; Arthur A. Eisenstadt, "The Role of Speech in the New Jersey School Program," The Speech Teacher, XVIII (September 1969), 213-216; and Charles R. Petrie, Jr., and Thomas R. McManus, "The Status of Speech in Ohio Secondary Schools," The Speech Teacher, XVII (January 1968), 19-26.

2. Support was found for Ogilvie's contention that large schools have the most diverse of programs and that they generally have the greatest needs to handle students who need bidialectical or bilingual help, 44. Cf. Eisenstadt, 272.

3. School classification was used because these are categories generally

used when discussing school size, particularly in terms of curriculum and extra curriculur activities. Categories are: 4A, 1120 students and over; 3A, 500-1119; 2A, 230-499; 1A, 120-229; and B, under 119.

4. Pluralism is more easily tolerated with an oral communication model rather than a traditional speech model. The former emphasizes the use of oral communication to live together agreeably, to succeed in a career dependent on oral communication, to minimize noise between encoder and decoder, and to de-emphasize platform performance judged by traditional standards. A teacher using a traditional speech model may approach bilingual, culturally different, and low socio-economic students solely with a desire for remediation. The implicit value judgment may discourage students who could benefit most. Also, whereas the traditional speech model rewards middle class Anglos, the oral communication model imposes upon them a responsibility to learn to communicate with those outside their immediate culture. The prevailing traditional speech model accounts for the population of speech class typically being middle class Anglos.

5. See Allan D. Frank, "A Communication Approach to High School Speech Curricula," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, (December 1970), 51-61.

6. The authors are not insisting that a standardized, statewide curriculum guide should be mandatory or is advisable. Actually pluralistic curricula are desireable when skillfully adapted to student needs; however, certain fundamental similarities are

necessary. The authors suspect that contest activities are presently the prime influence causing similarity in speech courses.

7. Cf. Donald W. Klopf, "The High School Basic Speech Text," The Speech Teacher, XIX (January 1970), 78-82; Cf. Petrie and McManus, 23. Text selection is limited by a state board.

8. Cf. Eisenstadt, 272; Sinzinger, 213, and Petrie and McManus, 20,24.

9. The behavioral objectives indicated here are those of the respondents and reflect an unsophisticated understanding of the content and format usually indicated in the literature.

10. Support was found for Fausti and Vogelsang's argument that administrators do not completely support speech education, 53. Cf. Petrie and McManus, 25.

11. Cf. Brooks, 277-278. Texas is far below those states reported by Brooks. Petrie and McManus report that 11 per cent of Ohio schools require speech, 23.

12. Cf. Brooks, 280, Eisenstadt, 272, and Petrie and McManus, 20. Comparative statistics are unavailable to determine the adequacy of training in other fields, but appearance is that 30-40 per cent of speech teachers are inadequately trained.

13. Administrative changes include counseling procedures for getting students into speech; hour of day for offering speech; courses which conflict with and compete with speech; work load, especially in handling student activities; separation of speech and drama; and stronger administrative support.

14. Expanded curriculum in Speech includes subject areas not included in the traditional course or more courses in standard curriculum but not taught at the particular school.

15. Eisenstadt, 274, notes similar reactions by teachers in New Jersey schools in his 1956 report.

16. Cf. Eisenstadt, 275, who argued for activities and emphasized inculcating high standards of public speaking skills through activities. See also Sinzinger, 215.